

## **REMARKS**

### **Amendments to the Specification**

The third paragraph of Page 1, beginning at Line 19 and continuing onto Page 2, and the paragraph from the beginning of Page 6 and continuing onto Page 7 have been amended as set forth above to correct spelling and other errors. In addition, the last paragraph beginning on Page 10 has been amended for the same reasons.

### **Claim Objections**

Various amendments to Claims 32-33, 35 and 37-38 have been made, such as correction of typographical errors and modifications to make claim terms consistent, which the Applicant submits address any claim objections made by the Examiner in the Action. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim objections are respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Action rejects Claim 34 as being indefinite for reciting “alternating array”. Claim 34 has been canceled and its features have been added to Claim 12.

In the rejection of Claim 34, the Examiner reasoned that “alternating” in “alternating array” requires specification of at least two different arrays. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 32 recites that the “third regions are arranged in an alternating array,” i.e., an array of alternating third regions. Claim 32 does not recite more than one array. It is submitted this recitation is sufficiently definite as presented.

The Action rejects Claim 35 for insufficient antecedent basis. The limitation “said first collector regions” in Claim 35 has been amended to recited “said first regions.”

The Action rejects Claim 36 for insufficient antecedent basis. Claim 36 has been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. §112 should be withdrawn.

The Action rejects Claim 37 for indefiniteness. Although the Applicant believes that the phrase “box like” in Claim 37 is sufficiently definite, Claim 37 has been amended to recite “box shaped,” as recited in the description of the drawing of FIG. 5D and found in the Specification, Page 9.

Claim 38 has been amended to recite “said second regions” rather than “said plurality of second semiconductor base region electrical contact conductor elements”. The Applicant submits that this amendment addresses the insufficient antecedent basis rejection of Claim 38.

Claim 38 also has been amended to recite “said third regions” rather than “said third semiconductor emitter region electrical contact conductors”. Applicant submits that this amendment addresses the second insufficient antecedent basis rejection of Claim 38.

It is submitted that the foregoing amendments address each § 112 rejection set forth in the Action. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112 rejections are respectfully requested.

#### **Claims Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

The Action rejects Independent Claim 32 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,850,095 to Chen et al. under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Claim 36 is only rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 rather than under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). The deficiency of Claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. §112 has been addressed as described above. Features of Claim 36 have been added in Claim 32. Therefore, it is submitted that Claim 32 is not anticipated.

The Applicant also would like to note, however, that Claim 32 is allowable over Chen without the amendments, as argued, for example, in the parent applications that issued as U.S. Patent Nos. 6,472,286 and 6,720,625 and divisional applications issued as U.S. Patent Nos. 6,888,201 and 6,891,230. The subject matter of original Claim 36 is pursued herein solely in consideration of the claim scope already granted in the aforementioned patents, not because of any concession as to the patentability of original Claim 32.

#### **Newly Added Claims**

Appl. No. 10/791,022  
Reply to Office Action of September, 2005

New Claims 47-55 have been added. Claims 47 and 48 depend from Claims 38 and 32, respectively. Claims 47 and 48 are allowed for at least reasons set forth above in connection with Claims 38 and 32.

New Claim 49 recited features similar to those set forth in cancelled Claim 36, and amended into Claim 32. For at least the reasons set forth in connection with Claim 32, it is submitted that Claim 49 should be allowed.

Claims 50-55 depend from Claim 49, and should be allowed for at least the same reason described above. Accordingly, examination and allowance of these claims are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to that effect is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any excess payment that may be associated with this communication to deposit account **04-1679**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9/16/05

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph A. Powers, Reg. No.: 47,006  
Attorney For Applicant

DUANE MORRIS LLP  
30 South 17<sup>th</sup> Street  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-4196  
(215) 979-1842 (Telephone)  
(215) 979-1020 (Fax)